



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,452	01/12/2006	Christina Ammann	112701-703	8957
29157	7590	12/01/2009	EXAMINER	
K&L Gates LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690				GWARTNEY, ELIZABETH A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1794
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/01/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/564,452	AMMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elizabeth Gwartney	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 8-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 8-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed 08/11/2009 has been entered. Claims 1-2, 5 and 8-15 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-2, 5 and 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spivey-Krobath et al. (WO 02/39834) in view of Brassart et al. (US 6,489,310).

Regarding claims 1-2 and 5 Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose a liquid or powdered reconstitutable nutritional composition (Abstract, p.5/L35- p.6/L3, p.8/L14-18) comprising a 7.0g or 10.5g protein/100ml composition, a source of digestible carbohydrates, and a source of dietary fiber, having an energy density of 1.6 kcal/ml and dietary fiber in an amount of 4 g. to about 50 g per 300 g of the composition (Abstract, p.3/L15-17, p.5/L5, p.10/Table 1). Spivey-Krobath et al. also disclose a composition wherein the source of fiber comprises 70% by weight fructooligosaccharide (i.e. oligosaccharide) and 30% by weight inulin (i.e. soluble fiber (p.10/Table 1) or a combination of fructooligosaccharide (i.e. soluble non-starch polysaccharide) and acacia gum (i.e. soluble non-starch polysaccharide) (p.5/L5-6).

While modified Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose a nutritional composition with 7g or 10.5g protein/100 ml, the reference does not explicitly disclose 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml.

However, it is apparent that the instantly claimed amount of protein, i.e. 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml, and that taught by Spivey-Krobath et al., i.e. 7 and 10.5g protein/100 ml, are so close to each other that the fact pattern is similar to the one in *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990) or *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed.Cir. 1985) where despite a “slight” difference in the ranges the court held that such a difference did not “render the claims patentable” or, alternatively, that “a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough so that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties”(see MPEP 2144.05 – I. Overlap of Ranges). In this case, one skilled in the art would expect that a nutritional composition comprising 6g protein/100 ml would exhibit the same properties as one comprising 7g protein/100 ml.

Further, Spivey-Krobath et al. does not explicitly disclose a source of fiber comprising the recited ratios including pea outer fiber (i.e. insoluble fiber).

Brassart et al. teach an enteral composition which contains a protein source, a lipid source, a carbohydrate source and a fiber blend (Abstract). Brassart et al. teach that the fiber blend comprises 5-30% inulin (soluble non-starch polysaccharide), 10-40% fructo-oligosaccharides (i.e. oligosaccharide) and 20-50% pea outer fiber (i.e. non-soluble polysaccharide) (C4/L40-44). Brassart et al. teach that enteral compositions containing a balance of soluble and insoluble dietary fiber are less viscous and can be used for tube feeding (C1/L66-C2/L3). Further, enteral compositions containing the right balance of soluble to insoluble fibers are more stable (C1/L66-C2/L3).

Spivey-Krobath et al. and Brassart et al. are combinable because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, nutritional compositions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a fiber blend including both soluble and insoluble fiber, as taught by Brassart et al, in the nutritional composition of Spivey-Krobath et al. for the purpose of producing a composition that is not to viscous for tube feeding and has increased stability.

With regards to acacia gum, given Spivey-Krobath disclose the use of soluble fiber including both inulin and acacia gum (p.5/L5-6, p.10/Table 1), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used acacia gum as the soluble fiber in the fiber blend of modified Spivey-Krobath et al. because doing so would amount to nothing more than the use of a known soluble fiber source for its intended use in a known environment to accomplish entirely expected results.

Given that modified Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose a nutritional composition identical to that presently claimed, it is clear that the composition would inherently possess the recited viscosity.

Regarding claim 8, modified Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as set forth above and that the composition comprises a source of lipids (p.7/L8-14, p.10/Table 1).

Regarding claim 9, Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Given that modified Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose a nutritional composition identical to that presently claimed, since lactose is not disclosed, it is clear that the composition would inherently be clinically free of lactose.

Regarding claims 10-12 and 14-15, Spivey-Krobath also disclose administering an effective amount of a powdered or liquid reconstitutable nutritional composition (Abstract, p.5/L35- p.6/L3, p.8/L14-18) 7.0g or 10.5g protein/100ml composition, a source of digestible carbohydrates, and a source of dietary fiber, having an energy density of 1.6 kcal/ml and dietary fiber in an amount of 4 g. to about 50 g per 300 g of the composition (Abstract, p.3/L15-17, p.5/L5, p.10/Table 1). Spivey-Krobath et al. also disclose a composition wherein the source of fiber comprises 70% by weight fructooligosaccharide (i.e. oligosaccharide) and 30% by weight inulin (i.e. soluble fiber (p.10/Table 1) or a combination of fructooligosaccharide (i.e. soluble non-starch polysaccharide) and acacia gum (i.e. soluble non-starch polysaccharide) (p.5/L5-6).

While modified Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose a nutritional composition with 7g or 10.5g protein/100 ml, the reference does not explicitly disclose 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml.

However, it is apparent that the instantly claimed amount of protein, i.e. 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml, and that taught by Spivey-Krobath et al., i.e. 7 and 10.5g protein/100 ml, are so

close to each other that the fact pattern is similar to the one in *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990) or *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed.Cir. 1985) where despite a “slight” difference in the ranges the court held that such a difference did not “render the claims patentable” or, alternatively, that “a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough so that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties”(see MPEP 2144.05 – I. Overlap of Ranges). In this case, one skilled in the art would expect that a nutritional composition comprising 6g protein/100 ml would exhibit the same properties as one comprising 7g protein/100 ml.

Further, Spivey-Krobath et al. does not explicitly disclose a source of fiber comprising the recited ratios including pea outer fiber (i.e. insoluble fiber).

Brassart et al. teach an enteral composition which contains a protein source, a lipid source, a carbohydrate source and a fiber blend (Abstract). Brassart et al. teach that the fiber blend comprises 5-30% inulin (soluble non-starch polysaccharide), 10-40% fructo-oligosaccharides (i.e. oligosaccharide) and 20-50% pea outer fiber (i.e. non-soluble polysaccharide) (C4/L40-44). Brassart et al. teach that enteral compositions containing a balance of soluble and insoluble dietary fiber are less viscous and can be used for tube feeding (C1/L66-C2/L3). Further, enteral compositions containing the right balance of soluble to insoluble fibers are more stable (C1/L66-C2/L3).

Spivey-Krobath et al. and Brassart et al. are combinable because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, nutritional compositions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a fiber blend including

both soluble and insoluble fiber, as taught by Brassart et al, in the nutritional composition of Spivey-Krobath et al. for the purpose of producing a composition that is not to viscous for tube feeding and has increased stability.

With regards to acacia gum, given that Spivey-Krobath disclose the use of soluble fiber including both inulin and acacia gum (p.5/L5-6, p.10/Table 1), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used acacia gum as the soluble fiber in the fiber blend of modified Spivey-Krobath et al. because doing so would amount to nothing more than the use of a known soluble fiber source for its intended use in a known environment to accomplish entirely expected results.

Regarding the intended use of the method, statements in the preamble reciting the purpose or intended use of the claimed invention which do not result in a manipulative difference between the claimed invention and the prior art do not limit the claim and do not distinguish over the prior art process. See, e.g., *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 938, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); *In re Sinex*, 309 F.2d 488, 492, 135 USPQ 302, 305 (CCPA 1962). If a prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use as recited in the preamble, then it meets the claim. See, e.g., *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997) and cases cited therein, as it has been held that the recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable. *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). See also MPEP § 2111.02 and § 2112 - § 2112.02.

Further, given that modified Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose method as presently claimed, it is clear that such method would intrinsically improve the digest tract and bowel function of a patient, inherently enhance mucosal barrier function in a patient, inherently promote gut health

or comfort in an elderly patient, inherently maintain or restore a well-balanced gut flora, and inherently enhance mucosal function in a human individual.

Regarding claim 13, Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose a method for preparing a nutritional composition comprising the steps of mixing a liquid or powdered reconstitutable nutritional composition 7.0g or 10.5g protein/100ml composition, a source of digestible carbohydrates, and a source of dietary fiber, having an energy density of 1.6 kcal/ml and dietary fiber in an amount of 4 g. to about 50 g per 300 g of the composition (Abstract, p.3/L15-17, p.5/L5, p.10/Table 1). Spivey-Krobath et al. also disclose a composition wherein the source of fiber comprises 70% by weight fructooligosaccharide (i.e. oligosaccharide) and 30% by weight inulin (i.e. soluble fiber (p.10/Table 1) or a combination of fructooligosaccharide (i.e. soluble non-starch polysaccharide) and acacia gum (i.e. soluble non-starch polysaccharide) (p.5/L5-6).

While modified Spivey-Krobath et al. disclose a nutritional composition with 7g or 10.5g protein/100 ml, the reference does not explicitly disclose 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml.

However, it is apparent that the instantly claimed amount of protein, i.e. 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml, and that taught by Spivey-Krobath et al., i.e. 7 and 10.5g protein/100 ml, are so close to each other that the fact pattern is similar to the one in *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990) or *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed.Cir. 1985) where despite a “slight” difference in the ranges the court held that such a difference did not “render the claims patentable” or, alternatively, that “a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough so that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties”(see MPEP 2144.05 – I. Overlap of Ranges). In this case, one skilled in the art would

expect that a nutritional composition comprising 6g protein/100 ml would exhibit the same properties as one comprising 7g protein/100 ml.

Further, Spivey-Krobath et al. does not explicitly disclose a source of fiber comprising the recited ratios including pea outer fiber (i.e. insoluble fiber).

Brassart et al. teach an enteral composition which contains a protein source, a lipid source, a carbohydrate source and a fiber blend (Abstract). Brassart et al. teach that the fiber blend comprises 5-30% inulin (soluble non-starch polysaccharide), 10-40% fructo-oligosaccharides (i.e. oligosaccharide) and 20-50% pea outer fiber (i.e. non-soluble polysaccharide) (C4/L40-44). Brassart et al. teach that enteral compositions containing a balance of soluble and insoluble dietary fiber are less viscous and can be used for tube feeding (C1/L66-C2/L3). Further, enteral compositions containing the right balance of soluble to insoluble fibers are more stable (C1/L66-C2/L3).

Spivey-Krobath et al. and Brassart et al. are combinable because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, nutritional compositions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a fiber blend including both soluble and insoluble fiber, as taught by Brassart et al., in the nutritional composition of Spivey-Krobath et al. for the purpose of producing a composition that is not to viscous for tube feeding and has increased stability.

With regards to acacia gum, given that Spivey-Krobath disclose the use of soluble fiber including both inulin and acacia gum (p.5/L5-6, p.10/Table 1), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used acacia gum as the soluble fiber in the fiber blend of modified Spivey-Krobath et al. because doing so would amount to

nothing more than the use of a known soluble fiber source for its intended use in a known environment to accomplish entirely expected results.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 08/11/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants find that *Spivey-Krobath* and *Brassart* alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest a nutritional composition comprising 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml composition as required by independent claims 1 and 10-15.

Applicants also find that *Spivey-Krobath* fails to disclose or suggest any viscosity for its nutritional composition. Applicants argue that the fact a certain result or characteristic, i.e. viscosity, may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic.

It is the Examiner's position that while modified *Spivey-Krobath* et al. disclose a composition substantially similar to that presently claimed including a protein content that "overlaps" (In this case, prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough so that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties"-see MPEP 2144.05 – I. Overlap of Ranges) with the claimed content of 4.5 to 6g protein/100ml composition, it necessarily follows that the composition would have a viscosity of 30 to 80 mPas. Given the slight difference between about 6g and 7g protein, one of ordinary skill in the art would not expect a composition comprising 7g protein/100 ml to exhibit a much different viscosity than about comprising about 6g protein/100 ml. Since the viscosity range presently claimed is fairly broad, given modified *Spivey-Krobath* et al. disclose a composition substantially similar to that

presently claimed, including protein content (see preceding argument), it is clear that the composition of modified Spivey-Krobath et al. would inherently display a viscosity in the range presently claimed.

Applicants argue that Examiner uses hindsight reasoning to in an attempt to recreate what the claimed invention discloses.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Gwartney whose telephone number is (571) 270-3874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 7:30AM - 3:30PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/E. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Keith D. Hendricks/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794